

IDAHO PARK AND RECREATION BOARD MEETING

**October 3, 2002—Boise, Idaho
WestCoast Hotel Boise Downtown**

Chairman Ernest Lombard convened the quarterly board meeting at 9:00 a.m. in the Selway Conference Room at the WestCoast Hotel Downtown in Boise, Idaho with the following board members attending:

Ernest J. Lombard, Chairman, Eagle
Robert M. Haakenson, Vice-Chairman, Hayden
Randal Rice, Member, Moscow
Latham Williams, Member, Ketchum
Jean McDevitt, Member, Pocatello
Doug Hancey, Member, Rexburg

Also present during all or a portion of the meeting were the following individuals:

Rick Collignon, Director
Debra Crawforth, Administrative Assistant
Jane Wright, Fiscal Officer
Rick Cummins, Administrator, Management Services
Dean Sangrey, Administrator, Operations
Dennis Coyle, Acting South Region Office Manager
David White, North Region Office Manager
Garth Taylor, East Region Office Manager
Myron Johnson, Development Bureau Chief
Rick Just, Coordinator, Idaho Outdoor Recreation Data Center
C. Nicholas Krema, Deputy Attorney General, Natural Resources Division
Chuck Wells, Trails Program Supervisor
Brian Miller, Grant Program Supervisor
John Crowe, Development Bureau Planning Supervisor
Connie Vaughn, Development Bureau Planner
Wallace Keck, Manager, City of Rocks National Reserve
Dennis Woolford, Ranger, Farragut State Park
Sharon Hubler, Executive Director, Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands
Donna Griffin, Funding and Resource Development Specialist
Steve Trafton, Executive Director, Henry's Fork Foundation
Don Knickrehm, Guest
R. "Whit" Whitham, Idaho Horse Council
Bill Hallock, Recreational Vehicle Advisory Committee
Al Wonenberg, Valley County Waterways
Ross Walkinshaw, Waterways Advisory Committee
Jack Olney, Recreational Vehicle Advisory Committee
George Lyman, Recreational Vehicle Advisory Committee
Bob McDonald, Land and Water Conservation Fund Advisory Committee
Jim Scott, Land and Water Conservation Fund Advisory Committee
Capt. Ben Wolfinger, Kootenai County Sheriff's Office
Brian Orr, Bonner County Commissioner
Tim Elsea, Director, Bonner County Public Works

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 1</u> | <u>AGENDA</u> |
| 1 | Chairman Lombard called for any additions or deletions to the published agenda. The following addition was requested: |
| .20 | Mr. Haakenson requested that an item be included in the agenda to discuss the vessel account balances. |
| .34 | Chairman Lombard noted this item would be placed under New Business, following the 2003 Board Meeting Dates agenda item. |
| .57 | Mr. Haakenson moved to accept the agenda revision as stated, and proceed accordingly. Ms. DeVitt seconded the motion. |
| 1.04 | Chairman Lombard called for discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. |
| 1.07 | All votes were cast in the affirmative. Motion passed. |

A G E N D A

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Quarterly Board Meeting

October 3, 2002

WestCoast Hotel Downtown—Boise, Idaho

Continental Breakfast Available: 8:45 a.m.

CALL TO ORDER: 9:00 a.m.

AGENDA: Additions or Deletions to the Printed Agenda
Adoption of Consent Agenda

Consent Agenda Items: Park YTD Attendance and Revenue Reports—Dean Sangrey
Development Project Status Report—Rick Cummins

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: August 13, 2002

WELCOME: Chairman Ernest Lombard
Introduce Guests

Presentations to the Board:

- 9:10 a.m. Outdoor Recreation Data Center—Rick Just
- 9:20 a.m. Camping Cabin Strategy—Rick Cummins/Myron Johnson
- 9:40 a.m. ATV Trail System Demonstration Project Status—
Dean Sangrey/Chuck Wells
- 9:55 a.m. Review of Farragut Resource Management Plan

ACTION ITEMS:

New Business: 10:15 a.m. Financial Report—Jane Wright
10:25 a.m. Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands MOA—Donna Griffin

Break: 11:00 a.m.

New Business (Cont.) 11:15 a.m. Advisory Committee Nomination Process for 2003
—Rick Cummins
11:25 a.m. Castle Rocks State Park to Include Castle Rocks Ranch,
Cahoon Property, Smokey Mountain R&PP BLM Lease and
State Lands in CIRO
11:40 a.m. Set Board Meeting Dates for 2003
11:50 p.m. Vessel Account Balances

Old Business: 12:10 p.m. Finalize Evaluation Criteria and Board Guidance for 2003 Grants

Lunch: 1:00 p.m. Catered On-Site

Old Business (Cont.) 1:45 p.m. Finalize Evaluation Criteria and Board Guidance for 2003 Grants
(Continued)

**DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL'S
REPORT:**

3:00 p.m. Heyburn Cabin Litigation—C. Nicholas Crema

Old Business (Cont.) 3:30 p.m. Harriman State Park Master Plan—Connie Vaughn

DIRECTOR'S REPORT: 5:00 p.m.

- Trail of the Coeur d'Alene Agreements with Tribe and Union Pacific Railroad
- Bear Lake Agreement
- Status of Proposed 2003 Legislation
- West Rock/Lake Cascade USFS Recreation Sites Update
- Public Information Program
- Review of Chapter 31 IDAPA Rules in 2003
- Update on Hells Gate Project
- Update on Bruneau Project
- Update on Old Mission Project
- OHMV Violations
- Orientation for New Board Members

BOARD MEMBERS' REPORTS:

EXECUTIVE SESSION: Under authority of Idaho Code 67-2345, an executive session may be held to discuss personnel, acquisition of private lands, and/or litigation.

FUTURE BOARD MEETING:

Agenda Items

ADJOURNMENT: 5:10 p.m.

THE BOARD

MISSION: To promote the general welfare and enhance the quality of life for present and future generations by developing and protecting, where needed, the state's significant natural and cultural heritage. To promote the appropriate use of recreation as a means of enriching society and the wholesome enjoyment of life. To provide a balance between individual rights and what is best for the common good. To educate and lead people to a part of the natural world. To touch the lives of all Idahoans in some positive way.

To work with other agencies and groups who are interested in the goals we may have in common. To maintain close contact with constituent concerns and represent their needs to the department. To be visionary in providing policy, direction, and leadership to staff. To advocate adequate funding for the agency's activities.

(1) This is the final agenda. Copies of the agenda will be available at the Idaho Department of Parks & Recreation, 5657 Warm Springs Avenue, Boise, Idaho. If you have questions or would like to arrange auxiliary aids or services for persons with disabilities, please contact the Director's Office at 208-334-4180, Ext. 302. Accommodations for auxiliary aids or services must be made no less than five (5) working days in advance of the meeting.

(2) The Consent Agenda addresses routine items the board may approve without discussion. An item may be moved from this agenda area to another at the request of the board.

(3) The Action Items address policy and program items the board may wish to discuss prior to making a formal recommendation or decision. An item may be moved from this agenda area to another at the request of the board.

(4) The Director's Report provides information only. An item may be moved from this agenda area to another at the request of the board.

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|------------------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 1</u> | <u>CONSENT AGENDA</u> |
| 1.30 | Mr. Haakenson moved to accept the Consent Agenda as presented. Ms. McDevitt seconded the motion. |
| 1.50 | Chairman Lombard called for a discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. |
| 1.55 | All votes were cast in the affirmative. Motion passed. |
| | <u>APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 13, 2002 QUARTERLY BOARD MEETING</u> |
| 2.00 | Chairman Lombard called for a motion to approve the minutes of the August 13, 2002 Quarterly Board Meeting as presented. |
| 2.36 | Mr. Williams requested that as a follow-up to the vote on tape locator no. 152.35 under the FY 2004 Proposed Budget (page 10), the priority list be attached to the meeting minutes. (<i>Attachment No. 1</i>) He noted that the priority on some of the items had changed and wanted to ensure those changes had been adequately reflected. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|---|
| <u>Tape 1</u> 12.00 | Mr. Just noted that weekly staff meetings to review research, any proposed actions within the state, and assigning staff members who can provide knowledge-based comments on the proposed actions would be a critical component of the team. Any responses to proposed actions will be forwarded to Director Collignon for his review. |
| 14.05 | Mr. Just described the data center as an internet-based resource where recreation planners in particular can go to access visitation statistics, facility inventories, and locate contact information. For the public at large, this site will provide access to any proposed actions within their area of interest. At some point in the future, the site is envisioned to include a forum where recreationists can communicate with each other. |
| 15.48 | Mr. Hancey inquired if the positions for the data center would require new hires. Mr. Just responded that all the positions, with the exception of the Human Dimensions Research Analyst, would be reassignments of current staff. Mr. Hancey also questioned the costs involved in setting up a website. Mr. Just said that due to the growth within the Management Information System (MIS) group, the department now has two database/system analysts who are already at work on three projects. As a result, the costs involved can be kept to a minimum. |
| 17.00 | Mr. Hancey asked if a basic cost analysis had been developed in conjunction with setting these goals. Mr. Just said that our agency has applied for a SCORPT grant from the National Park Service. He will supply that information to the Board in a subsequent mailing. |
| 17.20 | Director Collignon summarized the five positions assigned to the Outdoor Recreation Data Center. Four of the positions were basically on-board staff that have been reassigned. All of the staff were performing some part of these functions previously—Rick Just as webmaster and public information officer; Jim Poulsen as SCORPT and LWCF coordinator; Mary Lucachick as resource staff specialist; and Jeff Cook as trails program coordinator providing our land review comments. Regarding the Human Dimensions Analyst position and the website, the agency has submitted an LWCF grant request for \$100,000 to offset these expenditures. The grant will cover a five-year period, and existing salaries will provide the match. |
| 19.45 | Chairman Lombard commented on the data center by saying it would provide a more cohesive approach in responding to actions within the recreation community, and he endorsed the proposal. |
| 21.30 | Mr. Hancey voiced his concerns regarding the possibility of LWCF funds not being available to provide the grant which staff has requested. Mr. Just also echoed that concern, but believes this process must happen with or without the LWCF funding. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 1</u> | <u>Camping Cabin Strategy</u> |
| 22.17 | <p>Mr. Johnson brought an artist's rendering of the camper cabin for the Board's review. The rendering reflects a roof design capable of handling heavy snow loads. Another roof design will be used in park locations without heavy snowfall. Initially, Director Collignon, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Jim Thomas established initiatives—one to provide Idaho visitors with new experiences and the second to better utilize our campgrounds around the state. Some of the site criteria for location of the cabins include visitor compatibility, aesthetic considerations, utilization of existing campgrounds, drive-up access, ADA accessibility, and easy access to existing park amenities. The cabins will be advertised for bid this December, and delivery of the cabins is estimated for next April with as many as 55 cabins in place by July, 2003. Mr. Johnson reviewed many of the design elements integral to the cabins; for example, they will accommodate four people in one or two rooms, depending on the site, include heating (wood stoves) and air conditioning in some areas, and a large deck with a covered area for cooking. The cabins have not been designed for inside cooking.</p> |
| 32.16 | <p>Mr. Johnson distributed a Camper Cabins and Yurts Revenue Comparisons packet (<i>Attachment No. 2</i>) reflecting the variation in revenue generation based on the daily rental rate and varied occupancy rates for demonstrative purposes. Page three reflects a moderate approach from which the agency would establish its trends. The last page, printed on legal sized paper, reflects the best locations for cabins and yurts as recommended by park staff. Mr. Johnson discussed Oregon State Parks' extensive yurt and camper cabin system, with a current inventory of 158 yurts, 30 camper cabins, and 10 deluxe cabins. A deluxe cabin includes kitchen and restroom amenities in Oregon.</p> |
| 40.42 | <p>Ms. McDevitt, noting the lack of cooking amenities within the cabins, asked if the department would provide instructions to users to bring their own cook stoves. In addition, she asked if venting was included in the design to accommodate cooking inside the camper cabins during inclement weather. Mr. Johnson replied this issue is still in the discussion stage, but the issue is being addressed. The majority of usage will occur during the summer season, but in parks such as Ponderosa, winter usage will also be a consideration.</p> |
| 41.50 | <p>Chairman Lombard inquired about a cost estimate per unit. Mr. Johnson said that the camper cabins, on site and completely furnished, will cost around \$12,000. In addition, \$3,000 is being estimated to provide the underground utilities, pathways, and parking for each cabin. The total should not exceed \$15,000. In some cases, where multiple cabins are sited within close proximity, that estimate would be lower. Mr. Johnson noted there are a number of pre-packaged unit manufacturers, so the agency should get a good representation of the overall market when bids are received.</p> |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Tape 1</u> 136.50</p> <p>144.00</p> <p>148.18</p> <p>149.30</p> <p>150.10</p> <p>150.40</p> <p>150.45</p> | <p><u>Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands MOA</u></p> <p>Ms. Griffin introduced herself to the Board as IDPR’s new Funding Resource Development Specialist. She spoke of her enthusiasm for this position, and noted that even with our current fiscal situation, there are still untapped resources available to provide for exciting projects and partnerships to develop. She reviewed the partnership reflected in the Memorandum of Agreement between the Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands (Foundation) and the Department (<i>Attachment No. 4</i>) and the conditions contained therein. The agreement was approved and signed by Mr. Don Weilmunster, President of the Foundation, prior to the Board meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Hancey said he did not understand item no. 3 on the MOA—Department’s Undertakings. He requested clarification. Director Collignon explained that the department, in its agreement with the Foundation, is paying Ms. Griffin’s salary and expenses as a part-time employee. The Foundation will provide her with office space. Mrs. Wright’s financial expertise will also be utilized on joint projects between the Foundation and the department.</p> <p>Mr. Hancey inquired how the fundraising dollars would be distributed between the department and the Foundation. Director Collignon noted the many variables, which are involved in this process, which will basically be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, per advice from the Fish and Game Foundation. He assured the Board they will be apprised of any collaboration between the department and the Foundation.</p> <p>Chairman Lombard said this MOA provides the vehicle for the two organizations to work together, presenting a great opportunity that has been underutilized in the past.</p> <p>Mr. Haakenson moved that the Memorandum of Agreement with the Idaho Foundation for Parks and Lands and the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation be signed by the Chairman. Ms. McDevitt seconded the motion.</p> <p>Chairman Lombard called for any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion.</p> <p>All votes were cast in the affirmative. Motion passed.</p> |
| <p>150.50</p> | <p><u>ADVISORY COMMITTEE NOMINATION PROCESS FOR 2003</u></p> <p>Mr. Cummins said the Board member overseeing that region of the state nominates these positions. The Recreational Vehicle Advisory Committee has two positions open—Region 2 and Region 4. The Waterways Advisory Committee has two positions open—Region 2 and Region 4. The Off Road Motor Vehicle Advisory Committee has six positions open—all Regions. The Recreational Trails Program Advisory Committee has three positions open.</p> |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| Tape 1 219.51 | Chairman Lombard asked about the community's reaction to this change. Mr. Keck said that public meetings were held two years prior to this transfer of ownership. The Castle Rocks' property was privately held, so access to the property with the transfer to state ownership has been approved by the majority of the community. |
| 222.01 | Director Collignon summarized the title-to-title transfer with the National Park Service of the Hagerman Fossil Beds property for the Castle Rocks property. This has been a six-year venture, with the Castle Rocks property ready for trade in spring 2003. He noted the significance of the property as a world-class destination property with strong support from the climbing community as well as the local community. |
| 226.10 | Mr. Haakenson asked about development plans for the new park. Director Collignon commented on the approval of an RV grant this past spring, which provided funds for the design and engineering work on the Smokey Mountain Campground. The Castle Rocks site will be evaluated after the transfer is completed. |
| 228.25 | Ms. McDevitt moved to include all of the department lands outside of the boundary of the City of Rocks National Reserve in Cassia County to be known as the Castle Rocks State Park for management purposes. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. |
| 229.05 | Chairman Lombard called for discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. |
| 229.18 | All votes were cast in the affirmative. Motion passed. |
| 230.45 | <p>SET BOARD MEETING DATES FOR 2003</p> <p>Per policy, four quarterly meeting dates were set for 2003:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Period of January 15 thru February 7, 2003</u> In conjunction with the budget presentation set by the Legislature in Boise. ▪ <u>April 29, 2003</u> In conjunction with the Governor's Conference at the Coeur d'Alene Resort Hotel on April 30 thru May 2. Additionally, the dedication for the Trail of the Coeur d'Alenes will also occur during this period. ▪ <u>August 4-5, 2003</u> Two-day meeting in Sun Valley to include a work session on the budget. ▪ <u>November 6, 2003</u> In conjunction with the IDPR Annual Conference in Boise. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|---|
| <u>Tape 2</u> 0.10 | <u>VESSEL ACCOUNT BALANCES</u> |
| | Mr. Haakenson expressed concern with the balances reflected in Attachment #4—Motorized Boating by Area and County—from the August 13, 2002 Board Minutes. He noted that the attachment reflects twenty-one counties with a sizeable carryover balance—over 100 percent (<i>Attachment No. 5</i>). He said he is aware that some counties hold over funds to build their balance in order to accomplish a large project; however, the rule states that if the funds are not utilized, they will be returned to the department and are then redistributed to the other counties according to the formula. |
| 4.00 | Mr. Haakenson moved to establish the following agency oversight of the vessel funds. If the funds from the vessel account exceed 100 percent at the end of September 2002 in any county, then Director Collignon will request a response from the county commissioners as to how the funds are encumbered. If the encumbrance is considered a valid use of the funds, the Director will so inform the county; if not, the funds will be returned to IDPR for redistribution according to the formula. Mr. Hancey seconded the motion. |
| 5.03 | Ms. McDevitt opened discussion on the motion by asking if an amendment was needed on the motion to include a sunset clause. Mr. Haakenson responded that this process should occur every year. |
| 5.40 | Chairman Lombard noted that in the ORMV account, any monies remaining at year-end are returned and redistributed. Rather than so much focus on the criteria, perhaps the utilization of the funds and their allocation is the higher concern. |
| 7.20 | Mr. Hancey questioned the typical use of the vessel funds. Mr. Cummins said the funds are generated thru the sale of registration stickers, and 85 percent of these funds go back to the county. Each county has the discretion to use these funds in one of three areas—boating law enforcement, boating facilities, and boating capital improvements. The counties also accrue funds for a specific project, which are then reflected in the high carryover amounts. |
| 12.30 | Mr. Haakenson expressed his faith in the Director and staff's ability to evaluate these carryovers, since it is already being done with other accounts. The vessel account has been the only exception, and there must be accountability with all of the funds. |
| 14.04 | Director Collignon said he understands his responsibilities to the Board and wants to make them aware of the direction of the statutes and how staff can accomplish this request. The Statute directs that any monies over one year's previous allocations need to be returned within thirty days after the end of the fiscal year. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 2</u> | Director Collignon noted the department has an auditor in place that reviews these financial records. The Director quoted Idaho Code § 67-7013/Safe Boating Act—Remittance of Fees, which states: “(8)... <i>The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to specific sums of money in county vessel accounts for which the county commissioners have given written notice to the Department of Parks and Recreation of an intention to retain those funds for a specific purpose. The notice shall specify the amount of funds to be held, indicate the purpose for which the funds shall be utilized and provide the date when the funds will be expended. If an amended notice is not submitted by the county commissioners, moneys not expended or contractually committed by the date stated in the original notice of the board of county commissioners shall revert to the state vessel account for distribution as provided in this subsection. All interests earned on monies invested from the county vessel fund shall return to the county vessel fund.</i> ” |
| 15.46 | Director Collignon said the county auditors forward a year-end report to the department stating their fund balance and their intent. The Director noted the department’s current process might not be adequate in overseeing these funds. He would use his discretion in accepting a reasonable timeline to be established on a project as identified by a county. In addition, he would ensure the funds are returned to the vessel account when the timeline, which was agreed to by the county commissioners and the department, has not been met. |
| 18.38 | Mr. Williams noted the objectives of this motion are already covered in state statute, so the real issue is for the Board to give staff direction to closely implement the code and report back to the Board at the next meeting the results of those discussions, in addition to a summary by county reflecting their plans. |
| 19.32 | Director Collignon said the previous section of Idaho Code also speaks to the other part of this issue. The Director quoted Idaho Code § 67-7013/Safe Boating Act—Remittance of Fees, which states: “(6) <i>Only those counties in the state with a boating improvement program, as recognized by the department, shall be eligible to receive moneys from the state vessel account. Boating improvement program means that one or more recognized boating facilities are being developed and/or maintained by the county’s jurisdiction and/or that the county has or is actively developing a recognized boating law enforcement program.</i> ” |
| 21.30 | Director Collignon noted that in reviewing state statute along with this discussion with the Board, the department should implement a review of this program to ascertain if all of the 44 counties actually have a department-approved boating program. |
| 21.58 | Mr. Williams made a revised motion to instruct the Director to implement the provisions of statute and report back to the Board. Ms. McDevitt seconded the revised motion. |



| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 2</u> 23.04 | Chairman Lombard called for discussion on the revised motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. |
| 23.12 | All votes were cast in the affirmative. The revised motion passed. |
| | <p data-bbox="342 485 1273 554"><u>FINALIZE EVALUATION CRITERIA AND BOARD GUIDANCE FOR 2003 GRANTS</u></p> <p data-bbox="342 594 1463 1062">24.10 Capt. Wolfinger with the Kootenai County Sheriff's office spoke in opposition to the proposed criteria for the grant review process. He said the proposed changes do not incorporate the recommended comments given at the August 3, 2002 Board Meeting. Since Kootenai and Bonner Counties have over 30 percent of the navigable waters in the state and over 25,000 registered boaters, not including the thousands of out-of-state boaters, the users provide a major economic impact to North Idaho. In summary, Capt. Wolfinger believes the proposed changes will not promote or encourage the continuation of recreation opportunities in waterways in North Idaho. He said the criteria are too vague and requested that the Board return to the original rating criteria as written and distributed in the Waterways Improvement Fund Grant applications of September, 2001. Finally, he requested the department begin open and honest discussions with all of the partners to develop a workable, definitive, objective grant review criteria.</p> <p data-bbox="342 1106 1455 1467">29.14 Mr. Orr, Bonner County Commissioner, also spoke in opposition to the proposed criteria. He said if the department weights this program in order to add it to the other programs, they will be penalized and lose out on many opportunities. He echoed Capt. Wolfinger's sentiments by requesting that the department return to the original criteria for the waterways evaluation. He said he appreciated Mr. Haakenson's addition of the vessel account to the agenda and noted this was another area of concern for North Idaho recreationists. The issue of reciprocity and out-of-state boaters was discussed. He suggested that an agreement be worked out with adjoining states so it could be determined where these users boat a majority of the time, and if that time is spent on Idaho waters, then the state should receive some financial assistance in this area.</p> <p data-bbox="342 1512 1344 1581">36.55 Chairman Lombard concurred that the reciprocity issue is one that needs to be evaluated and possibly presented to the Legislature.</p> <p data-bbox="342 1619 1463 1833">39.00 Mr. Williams noted that in the rewording of the grant evaluation criteria, the words discuss the degree to which the project benefits a full range of users contributing to the specific program fund. Snowmobiles, for example, do not contribute to the Waterways Improvement Fund. He said if he were evaluating a project for a waterways grant, and it was a good project that served the needs of both small and large boats, it would receive a full score, regardless of the snowmobile issue.</p> |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|---|
| <u>Tape 2</u> | That is not what is written, and Mr. Williams believes the Board changed that intentionally based on the input they received at the last Board meeting. |
| 40.00 | Mr. Williams responded to Mr. Orr's comments on criteria no. 3 of the Proposed Grant Application Evaluation, which states: <i>"Degree to which project enhances or creates other recreational opportunities for the targeted user group."</i> He said he is also concerned about that statement and would make a proposal that the Board change criteria no. 3 to read: <i>"Degree to which the project reflects the intent of the program from which the funding will be provided."</i> That would remove the issue of the multi-use project requirement, but would still allow some criteria to evaluate projects differently within a specific targeted fund. Mr. Orr concurred. |
| 42.08 | Chairman Lombard said one of the intentions for revising the criteria was to assist with the formation of a more symbiotic relationship between the user groups. In addition, the revisions would allow the advisory committees more latitude and input in the evaluation process. |
| 45.40 | Mr. Orr requested that the Board not adopt the Grant Application Evaluation Criteria this year and asked for additional time so recommendations can be given to the Board. He requested a copy of the IDAPA rules, which apply to the grant criteria in addition to a copy of the grant criteria rating sheets. |
| 50.33 | Mr. Elsea, Director of Bonner County Public Works, spoke about his concerns with the new rating criteria. He believes they create a tremendous disadvantage to the northern counties in the state. The Bonner County Board of County Commissioners submitted a letter (<i>Attachment 6</i>) which makes two requests: 1) Prior to making a decision on these criteria, give the official interpretation of IDAPA. 2) Prior to acting on the criteria, provide an "Advisory Rating Guide Sheet." |
| 53.12 | Director Collignon noted that in the guidelines Mr. Elsea referred to, it was the department's impression they created more confusion than clarity. In the last review comments the department received, the input reflected that the guidelines created biases. Mr. Elsea said there seemed to be some confusion within the department as to what the criteria meant, but the guidelines provided clarity for the locals regarding the criteria. |
| 55.13 | Director Collignon said that in discussions with the advisory committees, the department has tried to understand their needs and allow them to use their best judgment in representing their regions and their users in evaluating and rating the projects. He asked Mr. Elsea if he believed the advisory committees were qualified to use the criteria as is, or do they require a department-issued guideline that may actually restrain them. Mr. Elsea said that this is not a matter of qualifications; they simply have a subjective guide sheet with no idea of how it will be judged. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|---|
| Tape 2 56.49 | Mr. Haakenson asked Mr. Elsea to clarify which section of the IDAPA rules he and the Bonner County Board of Commissioners would like interpreted. Mr. Elsea quoted IDAPA 26.01.31.150.02, Priority Rating Criteria, which states: <i>“The department and/or advisory committee shall establish project priorities by rating each eligible project using criteria established by the department. All eligible projects shall be rated by the committee. <u>Specific evaluation criteria for each recreational program shall be listed in their associated participation manual....</u>”</i> He placed special emphasis on the last sentence of this section of IDAPA. |
| 58.30 | Mr. Haakenson asked Mr. Crema for his legal analysis of this issue. Mr. Crema replied that he had not done an independent analysis of this rule so was unable to comment. |
| 101.30 | Chairman Lombard also read from IDAPA 26.01.31.150.02, and he noted the additional text within the administrative rules in this section: <i>“a. Conformance with legal requirements; b. Compliance with program objectives; c. Accuracy of estimated costs of the project; d. Potential of the project to enhance the health, safety, enjoyment and general welfare of recreational users in Idaho; e. History of prior recreational program grant management by the applicant; f. Adequacy of project design or construction, if applicable; g. The applicant’s level of matching share provided for the project; h. Suitability of the project for the proposed site, use and location; and i. Grant amount requested compared to the amount of funds available.”</i> Chairman Lombard said these are the criteria, as defined by IDAPA, and they are the same criteria the department utilizes on its evaluation form. |
| 110.22 | <p>Director Collignon said the intent of IDAPA 26.01.31.150.02, as noted by Chairman Lombard, is that the Board and advisory committees develop the criteria for prioritizing projects. Theoretically, the Board and advisory committees could annually make adjustments based on what the priorities is that specific year. The Director spoke of the past flooding in the northern part of the state where severe damage had occurred to boat ramps. The Board would have the latitude for adjusting the entire rating system to change the criteria so the projects and applications originating in the panhandle region would be given priority due to flood damage.</p> <p>Discussion continued on the pros and cons of the new rating criteria.</p> |
| 121.00 | Mr. Whitham addressed the Board and discussed the grant applications he reviewed based on the old criteria. He said there was only one item that the committee was given any latitude on in the past, but the new criteria allows the committee to use their good judgment as both committee members and users. He believes it is really that simple. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|---|
| Tape 2 124.00 | Mr. Walkinshaw addressed the Board and noted on past grant applications, the committees were only addressing five criteria with department staff reviewing the other items. With the new applications, the committee reviews ten criteria for each project. He said the committees believe they have gained more input into the process and are pleased with the changes. |
| 125.35 | Mr. Just reviewed the additional public comments regarding the evaluation criteria, which were received after distribution of the Board Agenda packet (<i>Attachment No. 6</i>). |
| 129.49 | Mr. Just read into the record a letter from Eulalie Teichert Langford, House of Representatives, District 32-B (<i>Attachment No. 7</i>). |
| 131.16 | In considering the weight of the comments received on the revised evaluation criteria, Mr. Just said there were 25 in favor, 9 against, and 5 that generally agreed but recommended some revision. |
| 136.10 | Further Board discussion followed. Mr. Williams proposed that item no. 3, which states, "Degree to which the project enhances or creates other recreational opportunities for the targeted user group" be eliminated. It should be replaced with the following statement: "Degree to which the project reflects the intent of the program from which the funding will be provided." He noted that his primary reason in rewording this is to eliminate the perception that the word "other" or "targeted" could place a good project at a disadvantage. |
| 140.18 | Mr. Rice said Chairman Lombard brought up an excellent point. The users, who are members of these committees, are a really critical element that the Board and department are trying to serve in the process. He said it appears, between the committees, staff, and Board, there has been a legitimate effort made to evaluate the issues and come up with a document that attempts to address all concerns. |
| 142.40 | Mr. Rice moved to accept the criteria as amended by Mr. William's previous discussion on item no. 3, and staff be directed to incorporate this into the user manuals that will be going out in the near future, that as part of the technical review process at each of the local committee levels, once they are finished with their evaluations, they be tasked to discuss with staff the strengths and weaknesses of the revised criteria they have been presented, so that at the completion of this project, staff can bring back an updated, really focused dialogue from the user groups on how this worked and how it didn't work. In a worse case scenario, the Board can look at this in six months, and if there are overwhelming or overriding issues that we just voted on, the Board can go back and change it. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. (<i>Attachment No. 8</i>) |
| 144.35 | Chairman Lombard called for any discussion on the motion. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 2</u> 144.42 | Mr. Haakenson cautioned staff that in attempting to interpret this process with an additional information sheet to the advisory committee members, issues were created. This set the parameters of how the advisory committee members would make their interpretations. He hoped that would not happen again. The grants are due in January, and staff will review them and undoubtedly pick up problem areas. Staff can then contact the applicant and suggest changes. In March, when all the advisory committees come together, they will know immediately if the evaluation process is effective. It will be important for staff to encourage the advisory committee members to make recommendations to the Board at that time. He noted that the Board wants to create the best situation possible, and he thanked Mr. Williams and Mr. Rice for their recommendations. |
| 148.16 | Chairman Lombard called for a vote on the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. |
| 148.22 | All votes were cast in the affirmative. Motion passed. |
| 148.35 | Chairman Lombard discussed a letter received from Mr. Tony Varilone on page 60 of the Board Agenda. Grant requests for equipment were then discussed along with the match requirements. Mr. Miller noted that a fifty percent match requirement for equipment requests would not be in line with our current IDAPA rules. Chairman Lombard asked about the process to include this requirement in IDAPA. Further discussion followed with the Board and staff. Mr. Williams requested that this subject be postponed for future discussion due to the lack of background information and preparation time. Director Collignon discussed the sensitivity of this issue during tight fiscal times and provided background information on the subject. |
| 200.30 | Director Collignon discussed the consideration of the Board in offering guidance to the advisory committees in the form of a cover letter. The letter would request the committees' consideration, in their evaluation and ranking, of the local government's match ability. |
| <u>Tape 3</u> .08 | Mr. Miller suggested a letter written by Director Collignon or Chairman Lombard giving the advisory committees some information on the process and the importance of applying the criteria fairly. In addition, the letter could stress the importance of giving their best effort in using the evaluation form in the manner intended. Chairman Lombard added that the letter could also request the committee members' feedback on the evaluation criteria. He asked that Director Collignon create a draft letter for his review. |
| 2.30 | <p><u>DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPORT</u> <u>Heyburn Cabin Litigation</u></p> <p>Mr. Crema gave the Board and Director Collignon an update on the Heyburn cabin litigation issue. He attended a hearing on September 9, 2002, before the District Court.</p> |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 3</u> | <p>The hearing concerned the three remaining issues in the Heyburn administrative appeal. Those issues include: 1) Whether the Board exceeded its authority by choosing a reasonable rate of return for the Heyburn cottage sites before the IDAPA rules had been ratified by the Legislature, 2) If that action exceeded the Board's authority, what the appropriate rate of return or the appropriate lease rate for those cottage sites were for calendar years 2000 and 2001, and 3) Whether an award of attorney's fees and costs were appropriate to the petitioner in the litigation. Mr. Krema addressed the court by citing an Idaho Supreme Court case that evaluated an identical situation. He said the Judge believed the case law was distinguishable from the current issue. The Judge believes that because the Heyburn lessees built their cottages on state land, all they could do was choose to accept the higher lease rate. Mr. Krema argued that these leases are readily saleable and commonly sold, but believes the Judge is viewing this as a fairness issue. On the issue of attorney's fees, Mr. Krema feels confident that the Judge will not rule against the department. He requested the Board discuss their next action. There are two possible alternatives: 1) Accept the court's decision that the lease rate for the calendar years' 2000 and 2001 was as the prior ten-year lease. The department would then be required to reimburse the leaseholders for the increase in lease fees during that time period. 2) Appeal the decision and request that the court's decision be overturned. In the event the department was successful in the appeal, those lease fees could be used to make improvements within the park. Mr. Krema asked for the Board's direction. After discussion by the Board, Director Collignon, and Mr. Krema, the decision was made to follow up with a conference call pursuant to an Executive Session since it would be to consider matters under litigation.</p> |
| 20.50 | <p><u>HARRIMAN STATE PARK MASTER PLAN</u></p> <p>Ms. Vaughn reviewed the Board's direction to staff in the revision that was placed in the final master plan under Chapter 2, Park Chronology: <i>"August 13, 2002—The final Harriman State Park of Idaho master plan, including comments made on the draft plan, was presented to the Idaho Park and Recreation Board for its approval at its quarterly meeting in Coolin, Idaho. The Board approved the master plan as presented, but directed staff to take some time to work with the U. S. Forest Service to develop a better management strategy for addressing the impacts of unrestricted dispersed camping currently taking place, as well as addressing the need for providing a wider range of RV camping opportunities at existing campgrounds within the Henrys Fork/Mesa Falls Corridor. The Board acknowledged strong support from the RV users for a wider range of camping opportunities in eastern Idaho and specifically the Island Park area. However, while reserving the opportunity to look at the East Harriman property as a site where IDPR could potentially help meet RV camping needs by constructing a campground with a limited number of sites, the Board encouraged staff to look at the proposed East Harriman RV campground as an alternative to be actively pursued only after 2005, and directed staff to first work with the U. S. Forest Service to explore other alternatives to meeting the needs of RV users in the Henrys Fork/Mesa Falls Corridor."</i></p> |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 3</u> | <p>Ms. Vaughn reviewed an additional revision, which was made under Chapter 7, Priority Levels and Costs Estimates Table, where the Fish Pond camping area item was moved from a Priority 2 level to Priority 3. In the description of the camping area of that section of the master plan, the description was amended to read: <i>“Construct a Camping Area Adjacent to Fish Pond—Provide access off highway 47 to Harriman East and Fish Pond. Construct a camping area adjacent to Fish Pond if staff is unable to successfully provide a wider range of camping facilities with another public provider. Provide water and restroom facilities.”</i></p> |
| 24.28 | <p>Correspondence was received on August 30, 2002, from Mr. Nelson Ishiyama and five other fishing outfitters in the Island Park area. A letter was also received from Mr. Steve Trafton, Executive Director of the Henry’s Fork Foundation, also in opposition to the campground. Ms. Vaughn then read the staff recommendation from the Agenda: <i>“Staff recommends that the Board keep in mind the entirety of the public comment received on the master plan that was utilized in its initial decision to direct staff to work with the U.S. Forest Service to address the impacts of unrestricted dispersed camping currently taking place within the Henrys Fork Corridor as well as provide a wider range of RV camping opportunities at existing campgrounds within that area. Recognizing that support from the RV users for a wider range of camping opportunities in Eastern Idaho is strong, continue to ask staff to not consider actively pursuing the proposed East Harriman RV campground as an alternative until after 2005, giving staff the opportunity to work with the USFS and other people in the area to explore other alternatives to meeting the needs of RV users in the Henrys Fork Corridor.”</i></p> <p>Ms. Vaughn said staff is bringing this issue to the attention of the Board and seeking their review and guidance.</p> |
| 27.38 | <p>Chairman Lombard noted that Mr. Don Knickrehm asked to testify before the Board. Mr. Knickrehm reviewed his background because he believes it is pertinent to the topic at hand. He’s a retired attorney who has fished the Henrys Fork for over thirty years. He is a member of Trout Unlimited, The Nature Conservancy, the Idaho Conservation League and other conservation-oriented organizations. He is currently serving as a consultant to The Trust for Public Lands. Mr. Knickrehm said he owns a fly shop, which is a licensed outfitter. He has served on the Citizens Advisory Committee for the master plan and is a former member of the Henry’s Fork Foundation.</p> |
| 30.00 | <p>Mr. Knickrehm discussed his relationship with the outfitters who have voiced their opposition to the camping issue, and he believes they are wrong. He said his only concern is that the process for developing camping at Fish Pond has been slowed down. He believes the department should move ahead immediately with the plan and pursue other opportunities simultaneously.</p> |



| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| Tape 3 31.24 | Mr. Knickrehm discussed his dismay with what he described as inaccurate information contained in an editorial in <u>The Idaho Statesman</u> . The gift deed from the Harriman's was inaccurately portrayed in the editorial. Mr. Knickrehm read from page six of the original document, Subsection 5. (i), which states: <i>"The people of the State of Idaho may either directly or by concession make such provisions as may seem to them proper for food, lodging, and saddle horses within the park. They may also make such arrangements for forestry, agriculture, and cattle grazing...."</i> He emphasized there simply are no prohibitions anywhere in this original deed on developing campgrounds within the park. |
| 35.00 | Mr. Knickrehm strongly believes that encouraging youth in fly-fishing activities should be on the agenda of the Board. Providing kid-accessible and ADA-accessible fishing areas, such as the area at Fish Pond, offers a unique opportunity within Harriman State Park. |
| 37.45 | Mr. Trafton, Executive Director of the Henry's Fork Foundation, addressed the Board and Director Collignon. He gave some background on their opposition to the camping proposal within Harriman State Park. He said he has received comments from a wide base of supporters, to include people from as far away as Japan to the local community to the Island Park Chamber of Commerce. He discussed the significant detrimental environmental and aesthetic impacts that a campground would bring to the Fish Pond area. He emphasized that Harriman State Park is a unique place, with 11,000 acres in the Henry's Fork watershed, still in pristine condition, much as the Harriman's left it. He said the Henry's Fork Foundation believes there are virtually limitless opportunities outside the boundaries of the park for campground facilities. He believes it is not the state's issue to manage the camping; instead, it should be the Forest Service managing this issue. The master plan should be resubmitted to the public. Mr. Trafton also discussed some improvements to be made in the department's current system at Harriman. The current fee of \$3.00 per day for fly-fishing is unrealistically low; in addition, a more aggressive approach to fee collection would assist in revenue generation. The primary users of the park are fisherman, so generate revenue from them, not campers. Mr. Trafton ended his address to the Board by noting that the Henry's Fork Foundation is one hundred percent committed to working with the department and the Board on resolution of these issues. |
| 50.00 | There was further discussion with the Board and Mr. Trafton regarding the campground issues. |
| 104.15 | Mr. Hancey made a motion that he, Garth Taylor, Don Knickrehm, and Steve Trafton go to the Fish Pond area personally and walk the property and see if they can come up with some ideas that everybody understands and feels comfortable with and report back to the Board. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| Tape 3 105.00 | Director Collignon said he would like to clarify some items. Regarding the campground, he believes there are already many limited service camping alternatives available. He is concerned about simply adding more to the current inventory of the Island Park area. If the department invests in camping facilities, then it should be an area that provides a wide range of camping opportunities. The implementation has been delayed for three years so the department can continue to work with the Forest Service on these issues, in addition to a trail management plan that is being developed at Harriman. Director Collignon discussed the uniqueness of the dispersed camping that is occurring in the Targhee National Forest in general, and at Harriman in particular. He believes that giving children access to the pond is a top priority. |
| 112.00 | Mr. Whitham spoke regarding his experiences at Harriman. He said he agrees with Mr. Knickrehm but not with Mr. Trafton. He is concerned with the unsupervised, dispersed camping that is now taking place at Fish Pond. If the area were regulated, it would provide a safer environment for all users. He also discussed his difficulty in finding an RV campground in the vicinity of Island Park. |
| 121.40 | Mr. Rice left the Board Meeting at 4:30 p.m. in order to catch a flight back to Moscow. He said he had attempted to change his schedule based on the length of the meeting but was unable to do so. |
| 122.40 | Mr. Just reviewed the 110 e-mails and letters that were received after the deadline for inclusion in the Board Agenda (<i>Attachment No. 9</i>). All the comments opposed an RV park. He also read into the record the comments Mr. Nelson Ishiyama posted on a fly-fishing website in opposition to the campground facility. He noted that the department's former director, Yvonne Ferrell, sent a letter opposing the campground due to the availability of other campgrounds in the area. |
| 132.00 | Further discussion on the campground continued. |
| 138.40 | Chairman Lombard said Mr. Trafton's comments that people are not paying enough to use Harriman State Park is a valid issue that needs to be addressed and resolved. |
| 142.00 | Mr. Hancey restated his motion/recommendation that a small advisory group composed of himself, Garth Taylor, Steve Trafton, Don Knickrehm, and Connie Vaughn go to the site and walk through it and see if we can come up with some ideas that we all feel comfortable with. As I said earlier, I do not feel comfortable with an RV site, but I do feel very comfortable with some managed campsites. Ms. Vaughn noted that Mr. Knickrehm had to leave the meeting but indicated he would gladly serve on any committee to provide assistance. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| Tape 3 143.00 | Director Collignon encouraged the Board to provide some definition for staff on what type of camping opportunities the department will be creating. Mr. Hancey noted that in forming a fact-finding group to walk the site and come up with a definition so everyone feels comfortable that it will not disturb the uniqueness of Harriman State Park is his recommendation. The Director noted that camping on the Harriman site is sensitive but must be addressed. The dispersed camping continues around Harriman within the Targhee National Forest. Chairman Lombard added that no other Forest Service area in the state will allow dispersed camping near designated camping areas. It was agreed there are issues that must be collectively resolved with the Forest Service and the Henry's Fork Foundation. The Director encouraged the Board to continue working towards a resolution to these issues. |
| 148.50 | Mr. Williams stated that he had asked Ms. Vaughn for a copy of the master plan because he wanted to see where this reference to RV was made. If you go back to the proposed development land use plan, it talks about constructing a camping area adjacent to Fish Pond, and it never says "RV". The only place "RV" occurs is in the timeline of the master plan at our August 13 meeting, in which there is an insert that talks about providing a wider range of RV camping opportunities. I would move that we instruct staff to strike all references to "RV camping" and replace it with just "camping" to accurately reflect the desires of this Board. The concept of camping is still on the table if another alternative camping site can be found. This Board does not endorse the idea of RV camping at that location, unless this is something that the Board is not prepared to do. Perhaps this is not the right time to take a vote on it. But I think there is some consensus on this Board that this is not an appropriate place for RV camping, and let's put that to bed publicly. |
| 150.06 | Mr. Williams said he would make the motion to instruct staff to strike the references to RV camping in the master plan because it does not accurately reflect the intention of this Board with respect to camping opportunities that are appropriate for Fish Pond. Mr. Hancey seconded the motion. |
| 150.25 | Chairman Lombard asked if camping in some form was still being considered. Mr. Williams replied that it is just camping. |
| 150.35 | Chairman Lombard noted that the department and Board would proceed with the process of looking at our alternatives, working with the Forest Service, the Henry's Fork Foundation, and all the other items that have been proposed. |
| 150.40 | Mr. Williams said there is some consensus among this Board that if we are not able to develop an alternative, that camping might be appropriate. I would like to leave that option open. If we can find a better alternative, then this becomes an area for day use fishing and other uses, but let's strike the "RV" part. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 3</u> | Mr. Haakenson asked if the Board was talking strictly about the Fish Pond area. |
| 151.18 | Mr. Williams said yes, as it is described: <i>“The Board approved the master plan as presented, but directed staff to take some time to work with the U.S. Forest Service to develop a better management strategy for addressing the impacts of unrestricted dispersed camping currently taking place, as well as addressing the need for providing a wider range of RV camping opportunities at existing campgrounds within the Henrys Fork/Mesa Falls Corridor. The Board acknowledged strong support from the RV users for a wider range of camping opportunities in eastern Idaho and specifically the Island Park area. However, while reserving the opportunity to look at the East Harriman property as a site where IDPR could potentially help meet RV camping needs by constructing a campground with a limited number of sites, the Board encouraged staff to look at the proposed East Harriman RV campground as an alternative to be actively pursued only after 2005, and directed staff to first work with the U.S. Forest Service to explore other alternatives to meeting the needs of RV users in the Henrys Fork/Mesa Falls Corridor.”</i> So, if I were reading that for the first time, I would assume that this is, it’s referred to, as the East Harriman RV campground. That may not be. |
| 152.50 | Mr. Haakenson said his concern is that he does not yet feel ready to say no to RV camping because there may be some places back up behind where you could logically develop some RV campsites in the Harriman Corridor. |
| 153.25 | Mr. Williams noted that Mr. Haakenson raised a good point, because it does talk about providing a wider range of RV camping opportunities in existing campgrounds within the Henrys Fork/Mesa Falls Corridor. Perhaps the reference should be left in for RV camping opportunities in the Corridor, but remove the reference to the East Harriman RV Campground. |
| 154.00 | Mr. Williams presented a revised motion to instruct Director Collignon to revise the language provided in the timeline of the master plan to accurately reflect this Board’s concern for RV opportunities in the Henrys Fork/Mesa Falls Corridor and to reflect the fact that this Board does not believe Fish Pond is an appropriate location for RV use. Mr. Hancey seconded the revised motion. |
| 155.50 | Chairman Lombard called for any further discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. |
| 155.56 | All votes were cast in the affirmative. Motion passed. |
| 156.00 | Mr. Haakenson brought up the issue of Mr. Hancey’s suggestion that a committee do a review and site walk of the Fish Pond area. He said he believes Director Collignon would like to join them as well. Chairman Lombard concurred, and said a separate motion would be required on this issue. |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|--|
| <u>Tape 3</u> 156.15 | Mr. Hancey made a motion that an advisory group made up of representatives of the Henry's Fork Foundation, Don Knickrehm, Garth Taylor, himself, and a member from staff go up and physically walk the Fish Pond area and determine the appropriate camping potential there. Mr. Haakenson seconded the motion. |
| 156.54 | Chairman Lombard called for any discussion on the motion. Hearing none, he called for a vote on the motion. |
| 157.03 | All votes were cast in the affirmative. Motion passed. |
| 157.25 | Discussion followed on a timeline for this site walk at Fish Pond. Chairman Lombard discussed the upcoming inclement weather and noted the sooner the better. |
| 158.00 | <p><u>DIRECTOR'S REPORT</u></p> <p><u>Trail of the Coeur d'Alenes Agreements with Tribe and Union Pacific Railroad:</u> The department has entered into an interim agreement that will allow public access onto the trail. The target date is October 19, 2002. The dedication is scheduled for next spring.</p> <p><u>Bear Lake Agreement:</u> This is still in progress, but the department should soon have a 25-year lease agreement on the North Beach property that will allow for the road improvement. The agreement with PacifiCorp is also progressing with an answer back in the next 45 days.</p> <p><u>Status of Proposed 2003 Legislation:</u> All of the department's legislation has been submitted with the exception of the Search and Rescue item, as directed by the Board. The Governor and his staff approved the other six pieces of legislation proposed by the department.</p> <p><u>West Rock/Lake Cascade USFS Recreation Sites Update:</u> This is a request from the Forest Service to look at taking over the management of five recreation sites on the west side of Lake Cascade. At this time, the department is not interested in taking on additional Forest Service sites without any operating funds to support them. The Director said he notified the Forest Service of this decision.</p> <p><u>Public Information Program:</u> With Mr. Just's new responsibilities in the area of outdoor recreation, Jennifer Couture is now doing the public information work. She is a part-time staff member working three days per week.</p> |

| Tape Locator Number | Discussion/Motion |
|---------------------------|---|
| <u>Tape 3</u> | <p><u>Review of Chapter 31 IDAPA Rules in 2003:</u> Mr. Cummins, during his convalescence after surgery, reviewed Chapter 31 of the IDAPA Rules. During 2002, the department focused on park operation rules. During 2003, the department plans to do a comprehensive review of IDAPA Chapter 31 recreation rules. The department is targeting next August for finalization by the Board. The Director noted he would keep the Board and our partners apprised on a quarterly basis.</p> <p><u>Update on Hells Gate Project:</u> This project is still on hold. The funding has not been pulled; however, the department has not yet been given approval to proceed.</p> <p><u>Update on Bruneau Dunes Project:</u> In our agreement with the Foundation for Parks and Lands and Ms.Griffin, the first scoping meeting will be held on October 7 to address the campaign and funding goals.</p> <p><u>Update on Old Mission Project:</u> The department was contacted this week; we were awarded the \$497,000 Transportation Enhancement Grant, which moves our funding total up to \$1.5 million currently. The final \$300,000 needed for this project will be moved up as a priority, and the department will move forward with signing design and engineering contracts now that the project is over fifty percent funded.</p> <p><u>OHMV Violations:</u> There was a request from the Board at our last meeting to provide additional information. Currently, there is no such tracking information available on these citations within the court system in Idaho. This will require a county-by-county effort, but this issue will be pursued.</p> <p><u>Orientation for New Board Members:</u> Director Collignon noted that neither member is currently present, so he will coordinate this orientation session at a later time.</p> |
| 204.20 | <p><u>ADJOURNMENT</u></p> <p>Chairman Lombard called for any further business to come before the Board. Hearing none, he declared the meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.</p> |

Ernest J. Lombard, Chairman
Idaho Park and Recreation Board

Richard J. Collignon, Director
and Ex-Officio Member of the Board

IDAHO DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
Grant Application Evaluation Criteria

Project Name: _____ Applicant: _____

Rater: _____

- | | | |
|-----|--|-----------|
| 1. | Degree to which project is reflected as a user need in current comprehensive outdoor recreation plans or surveys. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |
| 2. | Degree to which project benefits a full range of users contributing to the specific program fund. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |
| 3. | Degree to which the project reflects the intent of the program from which the funding will be provided. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |
| 4. | Degree to which project costs relate to project benefits. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |
| 5. | Degree of quality in project planning, design, organization, and coordination with IDPR staff and respective advisory committees. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |
| 6. | Degree to which applicant is taking direct responsibility for the management and delivery of public services and will provide meaningful outdoor education, responsible use or other public information at the site. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |
| 7. | Degree to which the project: creates opportunities not currently available in the area, addresses an important public health and safety issue or an element of a comprehensive project currently underway. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |
| 8. | Degree of effort, commitment, matching funds from other applicant sources or investment in the project as demonstrated by the applicant. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |
| 9. | Degree to which the project is providing new or protecting existing access to public outdoor recreation opportunities. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |
| 10. | Degree of urgency due to potential resource damage, or other impacts that may cause an opportunity to be lost if no action is taken. | _____ |
| | | 0-10 pts. |

TOTAL

NOTE: In reviewing recommendations of the Advisory Committees, the Park and Recreation Board retains the discretion to consider criteria, factors, or information other than the rating criteria considered by the Committee in awarding or denying the award of a grant.